

DOI 10.34132/pard2025.29.15

Отримано: 11 березня 2025

Змінено: 6 травня 2025

Прийнято: 3 червня 2025

Опубліковано:

30 вересня 2025

Received: 11 March 2025

Revised: 6 May 2025

Accepted: 3 June 2025

Published:

30 September 2025

Larysa Kurnosenko

ADAPTIVE RESOURCE MOBILIZATION IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION UNDER CRISIS CONDITIONS

The article examines the theoretical and methodological foundations of resource mobilization and transformation under crisis conditions as a key factor in the resilience of public administration systems. The purpose of the study is to theoretically substantiate and systematize approaches to mobilizing and transforming the potential of development resources in times of crisis, as well as to identify the key mechanisms of managerial readiness that ensure an effective transition from a stable to a crisis mode of public administration. The study demonstrates that modern crises – pandemic, military, and economic – require a shift from planned-stabilization management models to dynamic, adaptive ones based on flexibility, digitalization, and multi-level coordination. It analyzes domestic and international approaches to resource mobilization, institutional readiness, and the formation of state and social reserves. It substantiates that resource mobilization in crises is not only a technical process of engagement but also a manifestation of the cognitive, organizational, and behavioral readiness of administrative structures to act under uncertainty. A step-by-step structure of the mobilization process is presented – from situation diagnosis to system stabilization – together with the mechanisms of managerial readiness for transition between stable and crisis modes. The study proves that reserves act as an institutional form of preparedness, while their development, along with digital platforms (Diia, ProZorro), forms a new quality of state resource pro-

vision. A typology of differences in resource mobilization under stable and crisis conditions is proposed, allowing for the systematization of management actions and enhancement of system adaptability. The article concludes that the paradigm of mobilization has evolved from a normative-centralized to an adaptive-network model combining strategic planning, institutional flexibility, and proactive crisis response.

Keywords: public administration, resources, resource mobilization, resource transformation, crisis, crisis conditions, adaptive management, management readiness, resilience, crisis management.

Statement of the problem in a general form. In the modern context of increasing frequency and scale of crises – pandemics, wars, economic and technological disruptions – traditional models of public administration focused on stability and planning are losing their effectiveness. It is becoming evident that the success of public governance is determined not by the volume of available resources but by the ability to rapidly mobilize, redistribute, and transform them in response to emerging challenges. At the same time, academic research and practice demonstrate a gradual shift from centralized and normative approaches to adaptive, network-based, and digital models, where institutional readiness, multi-level coordination, and the development of crisis leadership play a key role. In this regard, it becomes relevant to theoretically generalize the processes of resource mobilization and transformation as a continuous management cycle that ensures state resilience and the capacity for rapid response under conditions of unpredictability.

Formulation of the objectives of the article (statement of the task). The issue of resource mobilization and transformation under crisis conditions has become particularly relevant in the context of the increasing frequency and scale of crises affecting the economic, social, security, and humanitarian spheres. Traditional models of public administration, focused on stability and planning, prove to be insufficiently effective during sudden shocks, when decision-making time is limited and resources are scarce or inaccessible. A contradiction arises between the need to ensure rapid response and to maintain systemic management,

between centralized control and the need for flexibility, between planned procedures and the dynamics of real threats. This problem is especially acute in the Ukrainian wartime context, where the state's ability to mobilize, redistribute, and transform resources determines not only the effectiveness of public administration but also the very viability of the national system. Therefore, there is a need for theoretical reflection and practical structuring of the processes of mobilization and transformation of development resource potential as a key factor in enhancing the state's resilience to crisis challenges.

The purpose of the article is to theoretically substantiate and systematize approaches to the mobilization and transformation of development resource potential under crisis conditions, as well as to identify key mechanisms of managerial readiness that ensure an effective transition from a stable to a crisis mode of public administration functioning.

In the course of the research, a set of complementary methods was applied to provide a comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon of resource mobilization and transformation under crisis conditions. The foundation was a systems approach, which made it possible to consider the mobilization process as an integrated, multilevel system where legal, managerial, institutional, and behavioral elements interact. To identify the theoretical patterns and the logic of the development of resource mobilization concepts, a comparative-analytical method was used, allowing the comparison of classical and modern interpretations of this concept in the works of domestic and foreign scholars. To distinguish the key characteristics of mobilization under stable and crisis conditions and to identify the mechanisms of managerial readiness for transition between modes, the method of comparative tables and structural-functional analysis was applied, enabling the demonstration of relationships among processes of planning, adaptation, and response. An institutional method was also employed to analyze the role of governmental, corporate, and civil institutions in forming reserves and maintaining resource resilience, as well as an evolutionary approach, which made it possible to trace the gradual shift in the mobilization paradigm – from a planned-stabilization model to a dynamic-adaptive one. To substantiate managerial mechanisms that ensure an effective

transition between stable and crisis regimes, the generalization method was used, including the construction of a table that structurally reflects the differences in process characteristics and means of managerial adaptation. This methodological approach provided a comprehensive view of resource mobilization as a socio-administrative phenomenon that integrates strategic planning, crisis response, and institutional transformation.

Analysis of publications. The analysis of recent publications shows that the scientific discourse on resource mobilization and transformation is gradually shifting from planned-stabilization to adaptive-dynamic models of management. Contemporary studies by A. Boin and M. Lodge (2021), S. Duchek (2020), and L. Comfort (2022) interpret crisis mobilization as a process of resource reconfiguration, where cognitive readiness, collective coordination, and the principle of redundancy play a key role, enhancing system flexibility. Ukrainian scholars M. Shtohryn, V. Ostapiak, and O. Kosiuk (2023), V. Kruglov (2024), and H. Starchenko (2025) emphasize digitalization, the synergy of centralization and decentralization, the implementation of flexible management methodologies (Agile, Scrum), and the role of ProZorro and Diia platforms in transforming state mechanisms. At the same time, the works of I. Holinka, Yu. Bilokon, and O. Storozh (2021-2025) highlight the importance of state and social reserves for ensuring system resilience during crises. In foreign research (Patz, Goetz, (2017); Sydnes et al., (2025); Graf, (2024); Cedergren, (2024); Alirani et al., (2025)), attention is focused on institutional readiness, interorganizational coordination, and adaptive leadership. Collectively, these studies demonstrate a shift toward an integrated understanding of mobilization as a continuous process that combines planning, digital flexibility, and multilevel interaction.

Presentation of the main research material. Mobilization and transformation of resources in crisis conditions become a key task of public administration, as conventional mechanisms for meeting needs quickly lose their effectiveness. Modern crises – from the COVID-19 pandemic to full-scale wars – demonstrate that the effectiveness of response is determined not only by the volume of available resources but

primarily by the ability of the state and management teams to rapidly activate and reorient them in accordance with new challenges.

As O. Berdanova emphasizes, «the mobilization of resources is the first component of the resource provision process» [1]. J. McCarthy and M. Zald argue that «mobilization is the process of timely and economical engagement of resources (time, material, human) aimed at achieving collective goals» [2]. According to Ukrainian researchers S. Bohuslavska, in crisis conditions «resource mobilization is the maximum involvement of available material, human, and informational resources, the coordination of stakeholders, and prompt response» [3].

Transformation of resources in crisis conditions should be understood not only as their emergency involvement but also as a change in their structure and modes of use – from financial reallocations and production conversion to the rethinking of human and informational resources. As A. Boin and M. Lodge aptly note, «in a crisis, resources are not merely consumed – they are reinterpreted and reconfigured in accordance with the dynamics of events» [4]. As S. Duchek emphasizes, «organizational resilience is manifested in the ability to quickly adapt resources to changing conditions, turning constraints into points of growth» [5]. In this context, the mobilization and transformation of resources appear not merely as a technical process but as a reflection of the cognitive and behavioral readiness of administrative structures to act under conditions of limitation.

Examining the processes of resource mobilization and transformation, contemporary Ukrainian researchers M. Shtohryn, V. Ostapiak, and O. Kosiuk emphasize that the war has triggered rapid digitalization, adaptation of management models, and a revision of interaction systems between government bodies and society in the process of resource distribution [6]. V. Kruglov adds that under martial law there is a synergistic transformation of centralization and decentralization, digital models, and civil–military interaction, which indicates a new quality of the state’s resource provision [7]. In turn, H. Starchenko proposes a model of adaptive project management that enables the rapid mobilization and redistribution of resources through the use of flexible methodologies (Agile, Scrum) [8]. An important confirmation of the practical dimen-

sion of resource transformation is provided by innovative initiatives such as ProZorro and Diia, which have radically changed the mechanisms of managing budgetary and administrative resources – from procurement transparency and anti-corruption measures to the digitalization of public services.

Thus, the transformation of resources in the sphere of public administration unfolds as a multidimensional process – from conceptual rethinking and institutional reforms to practical digital innovations. It becomes a key condition for strengthening the state's resilience to crises and ensuring the effectiveness of response under conditions of instability.

Studying the general theoretical aspects of resource mobilization, D. Talalay identifies a number of characteristic features that remain unchanged regardless of the historical or political context of a crisis situation: the complexity and planning of measures, their temporary nature, the coverage of all spheres of economic life, legal regulation, as well as the targeted focus on eliminating or minimizing the consequences of the crisis. Among the specific features of mobilization, D. Talalay includes a defined procedure, the scale and boundaries of mobilization measures, and the list and competence of the entities responsible for their implementation [9]. In this regard, mobilization can be viewed not only as a technical or organizational process but as a complex, multilevel phenomenon that combines legal, managerial, and resource components and requires a high level of preparedness of public administration actors to operate under conditions of constraint

An important component of the process of resource mobilization in crisis conditions is the formation and effective use of reserves – financial, material, human, informational, and temporal. It is the reserves that ensure the promptness of response when primary resources are depleted or blocked. The system of the state material reserve «is an important element of the economic security of the state, as it creates conditions for the continuous functioning of the economy and the life support of the population in emergency situations» [10]. Yu. Bilokon and O. Storozh emphasize that «effective management of state reserves requires a revision of the mechanisms for managing them, taking into account new risks and wartime challenges, which demands flexibility and adaptability from

public authorities» [11]. Thus, reserves in public administration are not merely stockpiles but a systematically organized potential that supports the resilience of managerial decisions in situations of unpredictability. They can also be viewed as an institutional form of preparedness – created not for preservation but for rapid mobilization under the pressure of time.

Foreign researchers emphasize that in resilient administrative systems, reserves are formed based on the principle of «redundancy», that is, the creation of surpluses or alternative channels of access to resources that enhance the flexibility of management structures [12].

The Ukrainian wartime experience has shown that reserves can be not only state-owned but also community-based or corporate – examples such as volunteer logistics networks, corporate funds supporting the Armed Forces of Ukraine, and community initiatives that provided medical, transport, or humanitarian support during the first months of the war have demonstrated the emergence of a new type of «social reserves». It is precisely through these horizontal reserves that the shortage of centralized resources is rapidly compensated, thereby maintaining the integrity of the administrative system under conditions of extreme stress.

It should be emphasized that resource mobilization is necessary not only in times of crisis but also during periods of stable functioning of administrative systems. Under stable conditions, it usually has a planned nature, is integrated into strategic documents, aimed at development or modernization, and takes place within predictable financial and temporal frameworks. As R. Patz and K. Goetz emphasize in their study of the role of United Nations administrative structures in resource mobilization, «large international organizations are increasingly formalizing mobilization as a key administrative function that is planned in advance, integrated into the management structure, and oriented toward the sustainable financing of projects» [13]. In this case, the focus is on the efficient use of resources within predefined objectives, and the process itself unfolds in a relatively predictable environment.

At the same time, mobilization under crisis conditions differs significantly both in speed and in decision-making logic. According to M. Seidens, M. Kjeve and A. Seidens, «a crisis environment forces

changes not only in the volume and direction of resource flows but also in institutional procedures themselves, since the time for coordination is minimal and the level of uncertainty is maximal» [14]. Under such conditions, priority is given to speed, flexibility, the ability to improvise (bricolage), and coordination between different levels of government and sectors.

Particular attention in this context is given by F. Graf, who studies the phenomenon of transition from a «routine» to a «crisis» mode in local government bodies. She notes that «organizations do not merely change the pace of resource utilization but create special rapid-response mechanisms that differ from standard bureaucratic structures» [15]. Thus, readiness for crisis mobilization is not formed spontaneously but is the result of prior institutional preparation that ensures a timely transition between management modes.

Results and Discussion. The sequence of resource mobilization and transformation in crisis conditions has a phased character, allowing for a logical and systematic transition from problem identification to the stabilization of the management system. Each stage of this process involves the engagement of specific types of resources and the application of corresponding institutional mechanisms that ensure coherence of actions and response effectiveness. The generalized structure of the stages of resource mobilization and transformation in crisis conditions is presented in the table 1.

Table 1.

Structure of the resource mobilization process in crisis conditions

Stage of the Process	Main Actions	Key Resources	Institutional Mechanisms
1. Situation Diagnosis	Risk analysis, forecasting of shortages	Analytical, informational	Situation centers, crisis units
2. Mobilization	Activation of internal and external reserves	Financial, human	State reserves, emergency funds

continuation of table 1

3. Transformation	Resource repurposing, digitalization	Intellectual, technological	Coordination platforms, Diia, ProZorro
4. Recovery and Stabilization	Governance system reform, performance evaluation	Institutional, trust-based	Development agencies, strategic councils

Source: formed by the author

In the process of transitioning from a stable to a crisis mode of resource mobilization, the ability of organizations to develop their adaptive capacity long before a crisis occurs becomes critically important. As A. Cedergren notes, «adaptive capacity exists before disruption occurs, and its core lies in the ability to recognize when available plans are no longer adequate and to replace them with new ones» [16]. In other words, the transition between modes requires not only the presence of crisis scenarios but also readiness for changes in the structure and logic of actions, which is cultivated during stable periods through scenario-based learning, experience accumulation, and practice in making nonstandard decisions.

In addition to organizational adaptability, an important characteristic is the development of flexible leadership and the ability to implement changes promptly. G. Alirani et al. note that effective management in a crisis requires managers not to react in a templated manner but to maintain «a balance between crisis management and routine duties, adapting services in real time while preserving the functional level of service delivery» [17]. Such a transition is possible only where management teams are trained to operate under dual pressure – both crisis-related and routine – which becomes crucial for ensuring the continuity of mobilization.

In this sense, the mechanisms of managerial readiness for transition between modes include pre-developed adaptation procedures, institutional flexibility, staff training for crisis scenarios, and the cultivation of a leadership culture oriented toward rapid decision-making under unpredictable conditions. These mechanisms not only

provide a functional bridge between planned resource mobilization and emergency response but also help to avoid abrupt managerial disruptions by maintaining a minimal level of continuity. At the same time, it should be emphasized that it is precisely the transformation of resources that ensures the bridge between planned mobilization and crisis response, as it involves their re-profiling, redistribution, and a change in the institutional logic of their use.

A comparison of the key characteristics of resource mobilization under stable and crisis conditions makes it possible to distinguish both the fundamental differences between them and the management readiness tools that enable a smooth transition between modes. A summary of these differences is presented in table 2.

Table 2.

Differences in resource mobilization under stable and crisis conditions and management mechanisms of transition

Features of mobilization	Stable conditions	Crisis conditions	Mechanisms of managerial readiness for transition between modes
Nature of the process	Planned, integrated into development strategies and programs	Emergency, situational, dependent on the dynamics of events	Flexible strategic planning, presence of crisis action scenarios
Pace of implementation	Unfolds within predictable timeframes	Immediate response, significant reduction of procedures	Rapid decision-making training, crisis simulations
Legal framework	Regulated by established legal acts	Often requires special emergency decisions and acts	Pre-developed packages of regulatory changes (contingency plans)
Resource allocation	In line with medium- and long-term priorities	Redirecting resources to overcome the threat	Mechanisms of redistribution and reservation of resources

continuation of table 2

Institutional logic	Dominated by bureaucratic hierarchy and formal procedures	Deviation from standard procedures, increased improvisation	Creation of cross-sectoral coordination groups
Scale and coverage	Limited to specific sectors or projects	Encompasses all key areas of public life	Integrated coordination platforms (multi-level governance)
Risk management	Focused on minimizing possible deviations within stability	Operates under high uncertainty and data scarcity	Embedded risk-oriented procedures and crisis headquarters
Communication	Transparent, planned, and accountability-oriented	Fragmented, focused on rapid information sharing	Crisis communication systems and a unified coordination center
Leadership	Strategic vision, support of stability, building trust	Rapid decision-making, personal responsibility, team mobilization	Development of flexible leadership combining crisis management with the preservation of core functions

Source: formed by the author

Thus, the comparison of stable and crisis mobilization modes shows that the effectiveness of the transition between them is determined not only by organizational procedures but also by the institutional readiness for flexible restructuring of management practices and rapid response to unpredictable challenges. The evolution of mobilization approaches demonstrates a gradual shift from normative and centralized models to adaptive, network-based, and digitally oriented ones. While earlier concepts viewed mobilization as a short-term reaction to a crisis, modern models interpret it as a continuous process integrated into the system of strategic management and aimed at strengthening state resilience. This

approach combines planning and flexibility, centralization and horizontal coordination, creating a foundation for the transition from reactive to proactive governance, which is a key condition for the effective functioning of public administration under crisis dynamics.

Modern scientific discourse emphasizes that the mobilization and transformation of resources during crises should be viewed through the lens of anticipatory governance. The concept of anticipatory governance, developed by D. Guston and D. Sarewitz [18], highlights that the key task lies in the institutional capacity to foresee possible development scenarios, integrate forecasting tools into the strategic planning process, and deploy resources in a timely manner before the crisis occurs. This approach allows resources to be seen not as a static reserve but as a flexible category that is continuously reconfigured in accordance with environmental dynamics.

The continuation of this logic can be found in recent studies, where anticipatory governance is interpreted as one of the key models that directly determines the quality of resource mobilization and transformation under crisis conditions. Thus, K. Muiderman, J. Vervoort, A. Gupta [19] draw attention to the dual nature of anticipatory governance: on the one hand, it can enhance the flexibility of resource mobilization by accounting for alternative scenarios, while on the other hand, excessive reliance on forecasts may constrain the freedom of institutional decision-making. This highlights that the effectiveness of resource utilization in crises is determined not only by their quantity but also by the quality of forecasting-based management models that underpin the public administration system.

Of particular importance in the practical dimension is the work of P. Tonurist and J. Orlik [20], which identifies the factors shaping the readiness of public organizations for anticipatory governance: leadership, professional competencies, trend monitoring, stakeholder participation, and appropriate organizational structures. In this approach, resource mobilization acquires an institutional character – it occurs through the creation of conditions for their early deployment, while transformation is implemented in the form of restructuring managerial configurations in accordance with emerging risks..

Similar ideas are developed in the OECD report *Building Anticipatory Capacity with Strategic Foresight in Government* [21], which emphasizes the role of strategic foresight as a tool for strengthening governmental preparedness. Forecasting is viewed as a process that transforms challenges into opportunities and thus facilitates the reorientation of resources toward areas that can ensure their maximum effectiveness within crisis dynamics. In this context, mobilization is interpreted not merely as engagement but as the anticipatory concentration of resources to create new points of resilience.

The conceptual foundation of this logic was laid out in the study *Anticipatory Innovation Governance* [22], where P. Tonurist and A. Hanson proposed integrating strategic foresight, innovative practices, and institutional mechanisms for resource preparedness into a unified system. In this model, the transformation of resources occurs through continuous innovative experimentation, which enables the rapid discovery of new forms of their utilization in an unstable environment.

The relevance of the cultural dimension of anticipatory governance is emphasized in the work of D. Ahern [23]. In it, anticipatory governance is viewed as an element of transforming the innovation culture, where the combination of foresight, experimentation, and learning shapes a new type of resource thinking. This confirms the thesis that the effectiveness of mobilization depends not only on institutional procedures but also on the ability of society and organizations to form an appropriate cultural foundation for resource transformation.

Particular attention to the regional dimension is given in the article by A. Maj, A. Wiktorow-Bojska, and K. Zubel [24]. The study shows that in the field of disaster management, anticipatory governance serves as an effective mechanism for strengthening the ability of local authorities to mobilize resources and adapt them to extreme conditions. This confirms that resource transformation is possible at the local level when institutions develop anticipatory capacity.

N. Alhajeri emphasizes that the mobilization and transformation of resources under crisis conditions should rely on the creation of flexible coordination mechanisms and the ability to rapidly change the functional purpose of resources in response to the unpredictable dynamics of events.

Mobilization here appears as the process of immediate engagement of material, financial, and human flows, while transformation means their repurposing and integration into new administrative configurations. In this context, adaptive governance is viewed as a model that combines scenario planning, institutional flexibility, and continuous feedback, ensuring the readiness of the public administration system for a seamless transition between stable and crisis modes.

An important complement to these concepts is the idea of *mobilizing structures* proposed by S. Tarrow. By this term, the author refers to stable organizational and network forms that enable the maintenance and expansion of collective action even after the initial peak of activity. Under crisis conditions, such structures may take the form of crisis headquarters, inter-municipal coalitions, digital coordination platforms, or hybrid public–civil alliances that combine administrative, civic, and private resources..

Thus, new approaches to resource mobilization in crises are based on three interrelated principles:

- adaptability and flexibility – the ability to modify the configuration of resource flows in accordance with the evolving situation;
- networking and cooperation – the integration of various sectors and levels of governance into a shared mobilization infrastructure;
- management readiness – the cognitive, organizational, and behavioral capacity to act under conditions of constraints and uncertainty.

It is precisely the combination of institutional capability and managerial readiness that creates the prerequisites for effective mobilization, transforming resources from a passive reserve into an active response instrument capable of adapting to the challenges of a crisis.

Conclusion. Summarizing the results of the study, it can be concluded that the mobilization and transformation of resources under crisis conditions form a new governance paradigm, in which the key factor is not the volume of available resources but the ability of the state, institutions, and management teams to rapidly reorient them in response to the dynamics of events. The transition from a planned-stabilization to a dynamically adaptive model of mobilization signifies a profound

evolution of public administration – from bureaucratic regulation to flexible, network-based, and digital mechanisms of interaction. The resource management system increasingly relies on preventive readiness, multi-level coordination, and the integration of crisis procedures into strategic planning. The formation of reserves, the development of social and corporate support mechanisms, and the introduction of innovative platforms such as Diia and ProZorro indicate the gradual establishment of an adaptive model of state resilience. Thus, effective resource mobilization in modern public administration emerges not as a reaction to extraordinary events but as a systemic attribute of a state capable of continuous renewal, synchronization of actions, and proactive management of development under unpredictable conditions.

АДАПТИВНА МОБІЛІЗАЦІЯ РЕСУРСІВ У ПУБЛІЧНОМУ УПРАВЛІННІ В УМОВАХ КРИЗИ

У статті досліджено теоретико-методологічні засади мобілізації та трансформації ресурсів в умовах кризи як ключового чинника стійкості систем публічного управління. Метою дослідження є теоретичне обґрунтування та систематизація підходів до мобілізації й трансформації потенціалу ресурсів розвитку в кризових умовах, а також виявлення ключових механізмів управлінської готовності, що забезпечують ефективний перехід від стабільного до кризового режиму функціонування публічної адміністрації. У дослідженні показано, що сучасні кризи – пандемічна, воєнна та економічна – вимагають переходу від планово-стабілізаційних моделей управління до динамічно-адаптивних, заснованих на гнучкості, цифровізації та багаторівневій координації. Проаналізовано вітчизняні та зарубіжні підходи до мобілізації ресурсів, інституційної готовності та формування державних і соціальних резервів. Обґрунтовано, що мобілізація ресурсів у кризових умовах є не лише технічним процесом залучення, а й проявом когнітивної, організаційної та поведінкової готовності управлінських структур діяти в умовах невизначеності. Представлено поетапну структуру процесу

мобілізації – від діагностики ситуації до стабілізації системи – разом із механізмами управлінської готовності до переходу між стабільним і кризовим режимами. Доведено, що резерви виступають інституційною формою готовності, а їх розвиток разом із цифровими платформами (Diia, ProZorro) формує нову якість державного ресурсного забезпечення. Запропоновано типологію відмінностей мобілізації ресурсів у стабільних і кризових умовах, що дає змогу систематизувати управлінські дії та підвищити адаптивність системи. Зроблено висновок, що парадигма мобілізації еволюціонувала від нормативно-централізованої до адаптивно-мережевої моделі, яка поєднує стратегічне планування, інституційну гнучкість і проактивне кризове реагування.

Ключові слова: публічне управління, ресурси, мобілізація ресурсів, трансформація ресурсів, криза, кризові умови, адаптивне управління, управлінська готовність, стійкість, кризове управління.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, L.K.; Writing – original draft, L.K.; Writing – review & editing, L.K. Author has read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable as study did not include human subjects.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: Data is contained within the article.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

1. Berdanova, O. (2014). *Zabezpechennia resursamy rehionalnoho ta mistsevoho rozvytku* [Resource provision for regional and local development]. Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
2. McCarthy, J.D., & Zald, M.N. (1977). Resource mobilization and social movements: A partial theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82(6), (pp. 1212-1241). Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1086/226464> [in English].

3. Bohuslavska, S., Melnychuk, A., & Motriuk, O. (2024). Kryzove upravlinnia v systemi okhorony zdorovia Ukrainy: praktychni ta teoretychni aspekty [*Crisis management in the healthcare system of Ukraine: practical and theoretical aspect*]. *Ekonomichnyi prostir – Economic Space*, 194, (pp. 18-23). Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.30838/EP.194.18-23> [in Ukrainian].
4. Boin, A., & Lodge, M. (2021). Responding to the COVID-19 crisis: a principled or pragmatist approach? *Journal of European Public Policy*, 28(8), (pp. 1131-1152). Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2021.1942155> [in English].
5. Duchek, S. (2020). Organizational resilience: a capability-based conceptualization. *Business Research*, (Vol. 13), (pp. 215-246). Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40685-019-0085-7> [in English].
6. Shtohryn, M., Ostapiak, V., & Kosiuk, O. (2023). Transformatsiia mekhanizmiv derzhavnoho upravlinnia v umovakh voiennoho chasu [*Transformation of public administration mechanisms in wartime conditions*]. *Koordinaty derzhavnoho upravlinnia – Coordinates of Public Administration*, (1), (pp. 247-260). Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.62664/cpa.2023.01.12> [in Ukrainian].
7. Kruglov, V. (2024). Modeli efektyvnogo derzhavnoho upravlinnia v umovakh voiennoho stanu [*Models of effective public administration under martial law*]. *Publichne upravlinnia: kontseptsii, paradyhmy, rozvytok – Public Administration: Concepts, Paradigms, Development*, (10), (pp. 64-73). Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.31470/2786-6246-2024-10-64-73> [in Ukrainian].
8. Starchenko, H.V. (2025). Adaptive approaches to project management in public administration: a model for an unstable environment [*Adaptyvni pidkhody do upravlinnia proektamy v derzhavnomu upravlinni: model dlia nestabilnogo seredovyshcha*]. *Problemy suchasnykh transformatsii. Serii: Pravo, derzhavne upravlinnia ta menedzhment – Problems of Modern Transformations. Series: Law, Public Administration and Management*, (16). Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.54929/2786-5746-2025-16-02-16> [in Ukrainian].
9. Talalay, D.V. (2011). The concept of mobilization: a general theoretical analysis [*Poniattia mobilizatsii: zahalnyi teoretychnyi analiz*]. *Forum Prava – Forum Law*, 2, (pp. 864-867). Retrieved from: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/FP_index.htm_2011_2_140 [in Ukrainian].
10. Holinka, I.V., & Bilokon, Yu.M. (2021). Formuvannia zapasiv materialnykh tsinnosti derzhavnoho materialnoho rezervu v suchasnykh umovakh [*Formation of material assets stocks of the state material reserve under modern conditions*]. *Ekonomika ta upravlinnia natsionalnym hospodarstvom – Economics and Management of the National Economy*, 3(97), (pp. 42-48). Retrieved from: <https://ema.ztu.edu.ua/article/view/242306/240244> [in Ukrainian].

11. Bilokon, Yu.M., & Storozh, O.V. (2025). *Certain aspects of the release of material assets during the reform of state reserves [Deiaki aspekty vyvillennia materialnykh tsinnosti pid chas reformuvannia derzhavnykh rezerviv]. Ekonomika ta upravlinnia natsionalnym hospodarstvom – Economics and Management of the National Economy*, 1(111), (pp. 55-62). Retrieved from: <https://ema.ztu.edu.ua/article/view/326068/315936> [in Ukrainian].
12. Comfort, L.K., & Rhodes, C. (2022). *Global Risk Management: The Role of Collective Cognition in Response to COVID-19*. www.routledge.com. Retrieved from: <https://surl.li/hjsvso> [in English].
13. Patz, R., & Goetz, K. (2017). Resource mobilization strategies and administrative structures in the United Nations system. *Proceedings from ICPP'2017: The 3rd International Conference on Public Policy*. Singapore. Retrieved from: <https://surl.li/afzmcl> [in English].
14. Sydnes, M., Kjeve, M., & Sydnes, A. K. (2025). *Interorganizational Coordination During Emergencies and Crises*. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2025.105310> [in English].
15. Graf, F. (2024). *Ready, set, crisis – transitioning to crisis mode in local government*. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2023.2242851> [in English].
16. Cedergren, A., & Hassel, H. (2024). Building organizational adaptive capacity in the face of crisis: Lessons from a public sector case study. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 100. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2023.104235> [in English].
17. Alirani, G., Oscarsson, O., Olausson, P.M., & Danielsson, E. (2025). *Adaptive Capacity in a Crisis: Turbulence Managers in StreetLevel Organizations*. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 33(1). Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5973.70017> [in English].
18. Guston, D.H., & Sarewitz, D. (2002). Real-time technology assessment. *Technology in Society*, 24(1-2), (pp. 93-109). Retrieved from: <https://surl.li/afzmcl> [in English].
19. Muiderman, K., Vervoort, J., & Gupta, A. (2023). *Is anticipatory governance opening up or closing down future possibilities? Findings from diverse contexts in the Global South*. *Global Environmental Change*. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2023.102694> [in English].
20. Tonurist, P., & Orlik, J. (2025). *Towards anticipatory governance guidelines for public sector organisations*. www.researchgate.net. Retrieved from: <https://surl.li/gwvyop> [in English].

21. *Building Anticipatory Capacity with Strategic Foresight in Government: Lessons from Lithuania, Italy, and Malta*. (n.d.). (2025). www.oecd.org. Retrieved from: <https://surl.li/qcikgj> [in English].

22. Tönurist, P., & Hanson, A. (2020). *Anticipatory innovation governance: Shaping the future through proactive policy making*. www.oecd.org. Retrieved from: <https://surl.li/rfayul> [in English].

23. Ahern, D. (2025). The new anticipatory governance culture for innovation. *European Journal of Law and Economics*. Retrieved from: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s40804-025-00348-7> [in English].

24. Maj, M., Wiktorow-Bojska, J., & Zubel, K. (2024). Natural disasters, anticipatory governance and disaster risk management from a local and regional perspective. www.preventionweb.net. Retrieved from: <https://surl.li/xjrnkv> [in English].

25. Alhajeri, N.A. (2024). The Impact of Anticipatory Governance on Crisis Management Preparedness and Disaster Risk Reduction in the United Arab Emirates. *bspace.buid.ac.ae*. Dubai: The British University in Dubai. Retrieved from: <https://bspace.buid.ac.ae/handle/1234/2693> [in English].

26. Tarrow, S. (2011). *Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics*. Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from: <https://surl.li/bztpx> [in English].

27. Nazarenko, O., Bazyka, S., & Shtyrov, O. (2024). Upravlinnia zminamy yak vazhlyva antykrizova komponenta rozvytku publichnoho upravlinnia. [Change management as an important anti-crisis component of the development of public administration]. *Publichne upravlinnia ta rehionalnyi rozvytok – Public Administration and Regional Development*, (24), (pp. 589-609). Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.34132/pard2024.24.12> [in Ukrainian].

Відомості про автора / Information about the Author

Лариса Курносенко, к. економ. н., доцент кафедри соціально-гуманітарних наук, Інституту публічної служби та управління, Національного університету «Одеська політехніка», м. Одеса, Україна. E-mail: lara_w@ukr.net, orcid: <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2309-695X>.

Larysa Kurnosenko, Candidate of Economic Sciences, Associate Professor, Department of Social and Human Sciences, Institute of Public

Service and Management, Odesa Polytechnic National University, Odesa, Ukraine. Email: lara_w@ukr.net, orcid: <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2309-695X>.

Kurnosenko, L. (2025). Adaptive resource mobilization in public administration under crisis conditions. *Public Administration and Regional Development*, 29, 1025-1044. <https://doi.org/10.34132/pard2025.29.15>